	Case: 1:09-sp-80000-AA Doc #: 42 Filed: 09/23/09 1 of 33. PageID #: 8621
1 2 3 4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION
5	
6	
7	ORAL SODIUM PHOSPHATE) SOLUTION-BASED PRODUCTS) Case No. 09SP80000
8	LIABILITY ACTION)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS HAD BEFORE THE HONORABLE
16	JUDGE ANN ALDRICH, JUDGE OF SAID COURT,
17	ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 20TH, 2009,
18	COMMENCING AT 1:30 O'CLOCK P.M.
19	
20	
21	
22	Court Reporter: GEORGE J. STAIDUHAR 801 W. SUPERIOR AVE.,
23	SUITE 7-184 CLEVELAND, OHIO 44113
24	(216) 357-7128
25	

PROCEEDINGS

(Case called.)

MR. CLIMACO: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me thank you all for being here and just make sure that everyone who is here has signed the sign-in sheet. If anyone missed signing in, we will be sure that before you leave, that you do sign it.

Initially, let's see, I need to remind the liaison counsel that the Court wants an electronic contact list of all the attorneys on each side. I think we have a list, but I am not sure if we have all of them.

MR. CLIMACO: We have ours, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Climaco.

MR. LANHAM: Sam Lanham from Maine. We cannot hear anything.

THE COURT: Can you hear anything now?

MR. LANHAM: Still cannot hear.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: If you can't hear me now, just raise your hand. All right.

(Laughter.)

THE COURT: If you didn't hear, what I suggested was anyone who didn't sign the sign-in sheet be

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sure that you sign it before you leave, and my clerks will be available for you to sign in, and then I was reminding the liaison counsel that I want an electronic contact list of all the attorneys on each side.

I think Mr. Climaco provided —

MR. CLIMACO: Yes, your Honor, we did.

MR. SNYDER: And, your Honor, Mike Snyder. We also just submitted ours as well on behalf of the

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, your Honor.

I think initially we should start with the things with respect to which everyone is agreed; that I am going to be appointing a special master, David Cohen. Mr. Cohen is right there, and I will be putting out the order appointing him, and the indication from both sides was that no one objected to my appointing Mr. Cohen.

He has done a considerable amount of work for other judges on MDL cases. He clerked for me in the early '90s, and he has been — has made great progress ever since. And also, I will introduce you to my clerk, Alex Frondorf, who will be the law clerk that is also involved with this case.

And I had appointed Mr. Climaco as the

1 interim Plaintiffs' liaison counsel, and I will now 2 make that a permanent appointment for the rest of this 3 case. 4 MR. CLIMACO: Thank you, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: And if I can then move on 6 to --7 MR. CLIMACO: May I raise a matter as to 8 Mr. Cohen? 9 THE COURT: You may. 10 It is the Plaintiffs' position MR. CLIMACO: 11 we would like to see Mr. Cohen have the authority and 12 responsibility and follow the model that was first 13 established in front of Judge Kathleen O'Malley in the 14 Selzer case and is now being utilized in the welding fume 15 litigate. 16 I am liaison counsel in the welding fume. 17 was with one of co-lead in Selzer, and I want to 18 represent to the Court and I know the great faith and 19 respect you have that both of those cases moved 20 expeditiously, not only because of the hard work of 21 Judge O'Malley and her staff, but we are talking about a 22 voluminous amount of litigation, and much of it, all 23 parties and all counsel were helped and have the greatest 24 respect for Mr. Cohen.

THE COURT:

Thank you. I think that's one

25

of the reasons I was pleased that no one objected to me appointing him as a special master, because I know from the work that he did with me, that we both moved expeditiously, and I want to see these cases moved as quickly and fairly as is possible.

The defense had as co-lead counsel

Nina Gusik of Pepper Hamilton in Philadelphia and Earl

Gunn of the Weinberg Wheeler firm in Atlanta.

MR. GUNN: Yes, your Honor. I am Billy Gunn and Ms. Nina Gusik is not able to be here today because she is taking her daughter to college, and I will have to leave early because I have a court order to be in Florida.

THE COURT: All right. And we now then have some issues here with respect to — well, one other question that I have with respect to the defense: It has been indicated that there may be some generic manufacturers who may at some point get to be defendants in this case.

Do we need to include any lawyers from — who are representing other defendants than Fleet?

Perhaps you can speak to that.

MR. GUNN: We haven't seen anything in response to that motion that was filed, and I believe we would be opposing expanding this litigation. This is

1 fairly well developed litigation, and when it is 2 appropriate, I will address it, but our goal is to 3 resolve this litigation; not litigate it. 4 THE COURT: I am very pleased to hear 5 that. 6 MR. GUNN: Well, yes. 7 MR. LASZLO: Your Honor, if I may, 8 Theodore Laszlo. I am the attorney of this group of 9 Plaintiffs' lawyers who has handled some of these generic 10 cases. 11 There is one pending in the Southern 12 District that we have tried to move into this because 13 this is the OSPS MDL, not just the Fleet MDL but the OSPS 14 MDL. 15 We understand that the defendants in that 16 case, Unico, Boeing and CVS, will object to the transfer. 17 Their papers were due, I believe, today, and we will 18 address that. Those defendants are represented by the 19 Reminger office in Cincinnati. So I would say if the 20 Panel decides to include the OSPS generic defendants, 21 they may, indeed, want that voice on the defense side. 22 THE COURT: But at this point in time, no 23 one thinks we should take any particular action. 24 MR. LASZLO: Not at this time, your

25

Honor.

THE COURT: Or just aware of what's possibly out there.

MR. LASZLO: Yes.

THE COURT: And I think it will depend a great deal on the extent to which some of those cases litigate. But I will listen to both sides when, and if we — that issue comes up, but I don't think there is anything based on what you both said, there isn't anything we need to do right at this point in time other than whatever the MDL panel may do.

MR. LASZLO: Agreed, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, with respect to Plaintiffs, we have Mr. Climaco as their liaison. We seem to have two groups who have met, I believe, at least three times in an effort to pick their lead counsel, and I would like to ask: Do you need more time to provide the Court with your choices, or are you telling me now that even if you keep on meeting any more, you are not going to make any more progress.

Mr. Climaco?

MR. CLIMACO: Your Honor, John Climaco, and I appreciate the respect you showed me by affording me the interim and appointing me lead. As the record will show, I requested and filed an application at the request of Paul Rheingold, Mark Tate, and some of my other

friends who I worked with in the past. I did not know the attorneys that have been led by Steve Foley, but I have come to know all the attorneys.

As a result of talking with them on the telephone, in meeting them in my office on two occasions, I have made an effort to have them joined together, and there are some issues that have separated them. They all — I am just literally amazed, your Honor, there is a lot more work to be done in this case.

But the breadth, knowledge, and the depth of knowledge of the attorneys who have litigated this case to date is huge, and I have great respect for them. I attempted to reach an agreement with them when they were in my office for lunch a few weeks ago, and today we had been meeting in my office as a group from about 11 o'clock.

I met last night with Mr. Foley, Mr. Laszlo, and some of the others. I met at 8 o'clock this morning with Mr. Shkolnik and Mr. Paul Rheingold, and after everyone — and I should take a moment, this is Dawn Chmielewski working with us, my partner John Peca and Gwen Hennessy are liaison. John is also a chef, and he cooked lunch. And after lunch, it was quite obvious that we weren't getting anywhere.

So I walked in, and I shut the door, and I

1 said "ladies and gentlemen, this afternoon I am going to 2 give my recommendation to the Judge. I believe I have a 3 responsibility, but I am going to walk out of here, shut 4 the door, and if you have fighting to do, do it right 5 here, and let's get it over with and reach an agreement." 6 It appeared from when I walked in and what I 7 heard that in many ways they were closer to a resolution 8 than I thought they might be, but at this time, they do 9 not have one. 10 My recommendation -- and I have told all of 11 them this before — is there be two co-lead counsel, and 12 that is this gentleman, who I would like to introduce you 13 to. 14 MR. SHKOLNIK: Good afternoon, your Honor, Hunter Shkolnik. 15 16 MR. CLIMACO: And he is Paul Rheingold's 17 partner and Steve Foley of Foley and Mansfield. 18 MR. FOLEY: Good afternoon. 19 THE COURT: Afternoon. 20 MR. CLIMACO: And now that you have 21 appointed me, your Honor, I will continue to act - one 22 of the early discussions was, well, if we have two, even 23 if there is some disagreement, which I never anticipate 24 there will be, Climaco can help break the tie, and I am

willing to do that. I have the utmost respect for these

25

two attorneys. Agreement can't be reached.

That's my recommendation, and there are enough good lawyers that once the co-lead are in place a Plaintiffs steering committee can be appointed, and we can work through this case.

With all that said and on the record, I think it would be useful, your Honor, to let me keep trying and give us a little more time, and I have told them I was going to ask for that. And if we were not successful, I also told them that I am sure the Court will make its own decision, and that might be two co-leads, three co-leads, one co-lead, but it will be the Court's decision.

And I said I know the Court would prefer that all of you make a decision. But they are — the reason they are good lawyers because they are aggressive, they know what they are doing, and everyone wants to be boss.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Well, I did notice there were three lawyers that are on both — both these groups, either on the executive committee or the steering committee, and that is Mr. DeCarlo, Bernard Daskal, and David Szerlag. So there has to be the potential for some agreement as to — for you to work that out, but I think

1	I am of the same mind here perhaps as Mr. Climaco and
2	would suggest that if you can work it out so the
3	Plaintiffs can choose their own lead counsel with some
4	agreement and with members of their executive committee
5	and the steering committee, I would prefer to have it
6	done that way.
7	So I will give you and the group until
8	August 31st to get back to me. If you don't have your
9	members, people selected, then the Court will proceed
10	very promptly to choose.
11	MR. CLIMACO: Thank you, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Well, I will choose counsel, and
13	for the executive committee, I think that by that time
14	they should be able to sort out the steering committee.
15	MR. CLIMACO: (Nodding affirmatively.)
16	THE COURT: Now, if there is anyone that
17	thinks I am missing something and want to comment on this
18	procedure, the gentlemen sitting across the room,
19	Mr. Climaco —
20	MR. CLIMACO: Yes. No, Mr. Tate —
21	THE COURT: It appeared to me he wanted to
22	be saying something.
23	MR. CLIMACO: No. Mr. Tate has decided he
24	has nothing to say at this time.

(Laughter.)

25

1 MR. TATE: Much to the chagrin of the entire 2 courtroom. 3 MR. CLIMACO: And there are a few others 4 that I had hesitation that you might be hearing from, but 5 we have silence. 6 THE COURT: Please don't both talk at the 7 same time because the court reporter can't get down what 8 both of you are saying. 9 MR. TATE: I have nothing to add, and 10 Mr. Climaco said everything. And the Court expressed its 11 opinion, and I appreciate that. 12 THE COURT: I think for the record here I 13 would like very much if each of the counsel would just 14 stand up and give us their name and with the Defendant. 15 So far we know that Defendants all represent the defense 16 here, Fleet, but with respect to the Plaintiffs' counsel, 17 what I would like to know from each of you is how many 18 clients do you have, how many in state court, federal 19 court, or not yet filed. So I quess it might be quicker 20 if we start with the defense counsel if you have give me 21 your name. 22 MR. KOULETIS: Nicholas Kouletsis, Pepper 23 Hamilton. 24 THE COURT: Thank you. 25 MR. NEKRAWCHAK: Good afternoon, your Honor.

1	I am John Nekrawchak with the Weinberg Wheeler law firm
2	in Atlanta.
3	MS. STAUBS: Good afternoon. Ellen Staubs
4	with Pepper Hamilton in Philadelphia. We represent
5	Fleet.
6	THE COURT: Thank you.
7	MR. SNYDER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
8	Mike Snyder from McDonald Hopkins. We are here on behalf
9	of Fleet, and we are interim liaison counsel.
10	THE COURT: Thank you.
11	MR. McKEE: Your Honor, Dan Makee, and I am
12	with Mr. Snyder, McDonald Hopkins.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MR. GUNN: Your Honor, we would request that
15	you go ahead and appoint them just as liaison counsel and
16	remove the interim.
17	THE COURT: I'm sorry. Yes, I thought I did
18	that. I'm sorry.
19	Yes, we will appoint them as liaison counsel
20	for the Defendant. So you are now permanent and not
21	interim.
22	MR. SNYDER: Thank you, your Honor. Thank
23	you very much.
24	THE COURT: Now we get to the Plaintiffs.
25	MR. TATE: Well, Judge, Mark Tate, and I am

here, I've got John Baker who is a lawyer who works with us and Susy Counsel who works with us as well. We have approximately 300 cases, and we have about 50 filed, all in federal court, and they have all been transferred over, and they are now in front of you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. SZERLAG: Good afternoon, your Honor.

David Szerlag, Pritzker Olsen, Minneapolis. I represent approximately 50 Plaintiffs. I have, I believe, 14 in the federal court, and all of them are venued out of Arizona at the present time, and I have none in state court.

MR. FOLEY: Steve Foley of Foley and
Mansfield. With me is Mike DeCourcy from my office and
Howard Wallach who is one of my partners in my Michigan
office.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. FOLEY: We have approximately 35 cases, I believe, filed right now, and I believe six are under consideration where we are going true the medical records at this point. All of them are in federal court except for a number — there are two in state court in Michigan and three pending in state court in California.

And all the others have been — there is actually one still in California Central District, which

1 has not yet been removed here. I expect eventually it 2 will make its way here. Otherwise, our cases are in front of your Honor. 3 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 MR. LASZLO: Your Honor, Theodore Laszlo, 6 Laszlo and Associates, Boulder, Colorado, and Cleveland, 7 and we probably have 12 cases filed all in federal court 8 and another 14 to 20 under consideration and evaluation 9 right now. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. 11 MR. DASKAL: Good afternoon, your Honor. 12 Bernard Daskal of Lynch, Daskal, Emery, and 13 with me is Scott Harford from my office. We presently 14 have, I believe, four cases filed, all in New York State. 15 The one case that we had before your Honor has since been 16 resolved, and we have about approximately two dozen cases 17 under investigation presently. 18 MR. SHKOLNIK: Your Honor, Hunter Shkolnik 19 with the law firm of Rheingold, Valet. My senior 20 partner, Paul Rheingold, is here as well. We have 50 21 cases under investigation at the present time; one in 22 federal court being transferred here if it is not 23 already, and one in state court. 24 THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. HARRINGTON: Your Honor, I am Kathyrn

25

1 Harrington with Hollis, Wright, and Harrington from 2 Birmingham, Alabama. We have five cases filed in federal 3 court in Alabama and 62 cases that we have under 4 consideration. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 MR. CORY: Good afternoon, your Honor. 7 Jerry Cory. I am from Birmingham, Alabama, with the law 8 firm of Cory, Watson. We have one case filed in federal 9 court and probably when it is all said and done we have 10 probably less than 30 cases. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MR. O'ROURKE: Excuse me. Your Honor, my 13 name is Michael O'Rourke. I am from Chicago. We have 14 approximately 50 cases under investigation. We have none 15 filed to date, and counsel I am working with include 16 Red Talber and Jack Kramer from Indiana, your Honor, in 17 the jury box, and we have 50 cases. 18 Thank you very much, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? 20 the back of the room? 21 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, my name is Arvin 22 Richards of Roetzel and Andress in Akron, Ohio, and I am 23 working with Mark Robchuk, and we have 2 cases we just

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

filed here in federal court.

24

25

1 MR. LANHAM: Your Honor, this is Sam Lanham 2 on the phone -- excuse me, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Yes. Can you tell us what law 4 firm you are with and how many cases you have in federal 5 court or state court. 6 MR. LANHAM: Yes. Sam Lanham with the firm 7 of Lanham, Blackwell in Bangor, Maine; one case filed in 8 the District of Maine and transferred to your Court. 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 10 MR. SHAW: Yes, and also on the phone, your, 11 Honor, is Shaw. I have got my own firm, Jeffrey O. Shaw 12 in Atlanta. 13 THE COURT: And let's go ahead, how many 14 cases do you have? 15 MR. SHAW: I have three cases transferred to 16 you, and I have about three others under investigation. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 18 MR. GOZA: Your Honor, my name is Kirk Goza 19 with the law firm of Goza and Holland in Kansas City; 20 have a case filed in state court but I think is in the 21 final efforts of being resolved and then a case that had 22 been transferred to this Court recently, and I have about 23 25 cases under investigation. 24 THE COURT: Thank you. 25 MR. SHUB: Your Honor, Jonathan Chubbs,

1 Cedar, Weiss in Philadelphia. If I can ask the Court to 2 skip over me, I am trying to get that information as we 3 speak to give you a report, so if I can go to the end. 4 of the line. 5 MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, Benjamin Anderson 6 from Anderson law offices here in Cleveland. We have six 7 that are about to be transferred all in federal court, 8 and we have 32 under investigation. 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MR. RHEINGOLD: Paul Rheingold, your Honor, 11 New York City. My partner Mr. Shkolnik has explained our 12 firm. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? 14 MR. KRAMER: Your Honor, Jack Kramer with 15 Red Taber, and our position has been previously 16 disclosed. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 MR. HARFORD: Your Honor, Scott Harford, 19 from Lynch, Daskal, Emery, and Bernard Daskal has 20 disclosed our position. 21 THE COURT: Thank you. 22 Your Honor, Jeffrey DeCarlo. MR. DeCARLO: 23 I am a sole practitioner. I have about 20 cases under 24 investigation; about 30 — approximately 30 cases filed 25 in federal court and another about 20 in state court.

1 Thank you. THE COURT: 2 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, Roger Smith with 3 Beasley, Allen; Montgomery, Alabama. We have two cases 4 that are pending here in your Court and about 20 cases 5 that are in various stages of investigation. 6 THE COURT: Thank you. 7 MR. ROSENFIELD: Your Honor, Ron Rosenfield 8 from here in Cleveland. I have one case that I am 9 co-counsel in that case with Mr. Laszlo and the Schaefer 10 case, she is a Cleveland resident. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 MR. KLEIN: Your Honor, Jeff Klein, Laszlo & 13 Associates. We have an office here in Cleveland, and Ted 14 stated our position on how many cases we have. 15 MR. M. LASZLO: Your Honor, Michael Laszlo, 16 with the law firm of Laszlo & Associates. Mr. Theodore 17 Laszlo has already explained our position. 18 THE COURT: Thank you. 19 MR. HUGO: Good afternoon, your Honor. 20 Hugo from Cooley, Manion & Jones. We have about 20 cases 21 under investigation. 22 Thank you. THE COURT: 23 MR. SENEGA: Your Honor, Mike Senega from 24 London, Ontario, Canada. I am here basically as an 25 observer here. I am counsel in the pending class

proceeding there at the law firm of Ciskins & Colby, LLP. 1 2 THE COURT: Thank you. 3 MR. BERTRUM: Jay Scott Bertrum, Bertrum and 4 Graff, Kansas City office. I know we that we filed 16 5 cases. We have looked at approximately 80, but I believe 6 we will file only 16. 7 MR. WALLACH: Good afternoon, your Honor. 8 Howard Wallach from the Detroit office of Foley and 9 Mansfield, and Mr. Foley has stated our position. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. 11 MR. MARTIN: Good afternoon, Clay Martin, 12 from the law firm of Martin and Helms in Oswald, Alabama. 13 We have two 2 filed cases currently. One is — there is 14 a motion to remand back to state court in Alabama, and I 15 have two more that we are likely to file soon and about a 16 dozen under investigation. 17 MR. CLIMACO: Your Honor, so the record is 18 complete, John Climaco. 19 We have one case which we are local counsel. 20 We are about to file another case, will be filed in this 21 Court. Dawn Chmielewski, who is also a nurse as well as 22 an attorney, is reviewing approximately 18 cases at this 23 time. If they are filed, they will be filed right within

24

25

the MDL.

Thank you.

MR. SHUB: Your Honor, I will be happy to report that I did get some numbers. We have 25 cases in federal court, and we are currently investigating several dozen. Jonathan Shub, S-h-u-b of Cedar Weiss LLP.

THE COURT: That gives me some idea of the enormity of this MDL. Many of you have so many cases filed and are investigating another 50 or another 25 or another whatever.

Is there a rough percentage when you investigate how many of them will go to trial and how many of them would perhaps have other causes for their injuries and whatever that wouldn't be appropriate; just to try to get some kind of an idea of the enormity of what the cases we are facing here.

MR. SZERLAG: Your Honor, David Szerlag, and for quite a while I was with Foley and Mansfield, and we reviewed probably at one point close to 5,000 cases over the last four years, and what we found out perhaps one in about 10 of the cases we investigated turned out to be related to the phosphate litigation.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FOLEY: Steven Foley, your Honor.

You inquired how many will actually proceed to trial. In all likelihood, it will be very, very few. In the course of the litigation to date, since it began

in December of 2004 — and Mr. Daskal filed the first lawsuit — one case commenced trial and resolved three days into trial with Mr. Gunn as lead for Defendant and myself as lead for Plaintiffs in California.

Since then, both sides have worked very hard to try to resolve the cases and avoid resolution by the jury, and we are continuing that process, your Honor.

MR. GUNN: Could I say something about that, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GUNN: Because your question about how many we are going to end up with is very important to everybody. As Mr. Foley said, we had a pretty good process going settling cases, and in December, there was a recall of the product, which has spurred a whole weight of claims.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GUNN: I would like to think that those claims are all being reviewed by now. It truly is our goal to try and resolve all this litigation. We have finite resources, and we are unable to allocate resources to claimants until we know how many we are dealing with.

If we settle 600 and all of a sudden we have

200 we didn't know about, somebody is going to come up short, and we would like to direct our efforts with the Magistrate to identifying the colorable cases and grouping them together and trying to find a way to resolve this.

THE COURT: Well, that's why I was — what I was driving at as well, was to try to get some idea of the magnitude of a number of the cases that you are going to have to deal with, and that's where it does make it important, that we do the preliminary discovery, and I realize also some of these cases were almost ready to go to trial or being settled when the MDL panel — I think it was the Defendant that asked for this kind of approach.

And so the quicker we can move along with discovery and with knowing, you know, exactly or pretty closely how many Plaintiffs you are going to have to deal with, I'd appreciate that.

MR. GUNN: In terms of discovery, there might be a dispute about this, but we believe most of the discovery has been done, and we would really like to spend Fleet's resources on resolving cases as opposed to reviewing documents and things.

THE COURT: And I think we will make that effort as well.

One other question: Does anybody know of any class action cases being contemplated so far?

MR. SHKOLNIK: Your Honor, for the most part — Hunter Shkolnik — for the most part, most of the lawyers we have been in contact with — and we have been speaking with many lawyers who have been advertising, who have been representing Plaintiffs, no one has been discussing a class action consumer case if that's what the Court is considering, the consumer case. Whether someone will file one down the road, it is hard to say.

Unless the Defendants are aware of one from the Plaintiffs that we have been talking to, that has not been the avenue of approach people are thinking at this point in time.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CLIMACO: Your Honor, I have come to learn that there is — that Plaintiffs' counsel would like to get to the spot that defense counsel is talking about as soon as possible, but there is considerable work that has to be done.

One of the things — and I think Mr. Cohen could help us considerably — as I understand it, there are a number of — (pause) — there are a substantial number of documents where Defendants have claimed privilege.

I understand there is a fairly extensive privilege log. Maybe that's one of the things we can get moving on quickly because that will help move this along.

MR. KOULETIS: Your Honor, if I could respond to that, the documents that have been identified as privileged from the collection of some 900,000 pages that have already been produced, in fact, were all submitted to Judge Goodwin in Virginia in the Burke case, and he went through, individually reviewed every single one of them and ordered us to produce 12. We think that process is complete.

There is no purpose served in reinventing the wheel over that. Obviously, to the extent we produce additional documents, there may be additional privilege issues, but that would be from our perspective a colossal waste of judicial resources as well as the parties' resources.

MR. LASZLO: Theodore Laszlo — and Mr. Foley addressed this in our papers — but Mr. Kouletis is not quite accurate about what Judge Goodwin did in the Burke case.

Your Honor, you have the transcripts of what actually did transpire in that event and in the Schaefer case that is before you, but what Judge Goodwin did was

take a representative sample and trying to on the eve of trial get through as many of the issues as he could. So to say he reviewed every single document is just inaccurate.

MR. KOULETIS: Well, with all due respect, we were ordered to submit every document that we were holding as privileged, and he reviewed them, and during that hearing, he specifically identified four documents having previously identified eight that he ordered us to produce, and he represented on the record that he had reviewed all the documents that we submitted to him.

He had ordered us to submit all of the documents we were withholding, which we did. There were four additional documents that he asked for some additional briefing on, which he never ruled on, but other than that very limited collection, he made it quite clear he was quite satisfied with the review process that had taken place.

MR. CLIMACO: Your Honor, obviously, disagreement, and that's why I suggest there is no one better to get into that very quickly than Mr. Cohen.

MR. GUNN: And, your Honor, we have no objection to Mr. Cohen or you talking to Judge Goodwin in West Virginia about that.

MR. LASZIO: Nor do we. That's why we provided all the transcripts.

THE COURT: All right. Then we are getting to my next — I think at this juncture I will turn over to the parties to produce a case management order. This is going to depend on the Plaintiffs being able to get their group together, and I have gone over with Mr. Cohen some of the specifics of what I want to see in this case management order, and I think that you can work it out much more quickly than having both sides file different opinions.

I did make clear to Mr. Cohen that I expect this to have at the end a definite trial date. It seems to me all the years I have been on the bench the only way to keep the lawyers from putting the case I am dealing with back on a back shelf somewhere is when they know there is a firm trial date by which everything has got to be done.

So that is the main thing I want the parties to come to an agreement on, and if there is no agreement, then they can, both sides can tell me why they think they can't get there that fast, and I will pick a date, but I would like to have all of these things dealt with.

And I think that in that — in setting up the case management order with dates, you can deal with

this issue of a tutorial. It doesn't seem to me that this case has the complicated chemistry or physics or whatever else I have had to deal with in patent cases, and that should be perhaps something very short from experts on either side and then maybe a short hearing in case — well, let the other side respond, or if you want to cross—examine the other side's experts or just counter with what one says with what the other says and perhaps have a fairly short hearing in case I still have questions.

But I don't want to see that taking up a lot of time and a lot of expense because I don't think that any of this is that complicated. But I do want you to deal with that when you are setting up the case management order, and, David, you have a lot more experience than I have.

Can we — let's see, you are going to come back to me by August 31st with the Plaintiffs' organization?

MR. CLIMACO: Yes, we will, your Honor.

THE COURT: And so then how much time do you need after you have your group, your organization together before the parties can meet with their executive groups and produce a case management order for the Court or at least one that gives me some disagreement where I

1 | can --

MR. CLIMACO: Your Honor, I am anticipating that if there is not an agreement we have reached as to leadership and I believe and I have good faith that we can do that, that the Court can issue an order almost immediately after we say we couldn't do it. So if you will give me one moment, I will be able to answer the question.

THE COURT: All right. Confer with your clients.

MR. GUNN: Billy Gunn.

But when they have a designated lead counsel, you know, within a day or two I would be glad to discuss with them the format put forth for you what you want.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GUNN: And I think we will be able to agree on that, and I agree while there are a number of issues, it is not a complicated matter, just a lot to assimilate.

THE COURT: Right. And also what I see covered is any kind of ADR possibilities that may work for some of the Plaintiffs; may not work for a lot of them but may work for some.

MR. GUNN: Once we know the population of

claimants, then we are prepared to engage in any type of exercise that anybody wants.

THE COURT: Right. My thought usually has been — I don't send things for ADR unless both sides are interested or think it can do some good. If you have one side that absolutely is adamant, doesn't think it will help, there is not a lot of point in having them get involved, but I think you may have a lot of Plaintiffs who would be interested, and I would like to see that covered in the case management order as well.

MR. CLIMACO: Your Honor, we would like to see and we would like to submit that on Friday, September 11th. We think that provides more than sufficient time once leadership is appointed, and leadership could very well be appointed much earlier because if an agreement is reached —

THE COURT: Well, if I don't hear anything by August 31st, then — September 1st or 2nd, you are going to have my appointment.

MR. CLIMACO: So by September 11th --

THE COURT: September 11th?

MR. GUNN: It is an interesting date, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, is there anything else that I need to ever could today?

1 David, anything else?

DEPUTY CLERK KIRKPATRICK: Judge, may I say something?

For those of you who know Renee Schumitsh, she is our MDL expert in the Clerk's office. Mr. Bush, you may want to take one of her cards, and she handles all the incoming cases for the entire District on all the MDLs. She is in charge of thousands of cases.

She is very helpful for any kind of questions you have regarding the clerk's office or filings or if you have any technical filings that you may encounter with our ECF program.

MR. TATE: Is that her business card? Can I have that?

Thanks.

THE COURT: Anybody have anything else?

MR. GUNN: I would like to float an idea, and that would be that once it is resolved who the committee and lead counsel is, that perhaps each side meet separately with Mr. Cohen and discuss issues and see — and he can make an independent determination as to, you know, where we are sort of in agreement and where we are not, and it may speed up this whole process if they are agreeable to each side meeting separately.

MR. CLIMACO: I don't think we disagree; we

just want to get moving. If that will move it, fine, but I think a lot of that direction is best in my experience coming from Mr. Cohen.

SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: We will be in touch.

THE COURT: All right. I will have his appointment order out in the next couple of days, too, and you can be in touch with Mr. Cohen with the parties. All right.

Is there anything anybody else wants to put on the record that they haven't had a chance to do to date? I do appreciate for many of you making the effort to be here, and we will move as quickly and as efficiently as we can.

(Hearing concluded at 2:25 p.m.)

_ _ _ _ _

CERTIFICATE

I, George J. Staiduhar, Official Court
Reporter in and for the United States District Court,
for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division,
do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true
and correct transcript of the proceedings herein.

s/George J. Staiduhar
George J. Staiduhar,
Official Court Reporter

U.S. District Court 801 W. Superior Ave., Suite 7-184 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 (216) 357-7128

_ ′